14:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

purpose of describing institutions to which this foreign terminology never was adapted. It is this expedient, invented in order to become *understood abroad*, and because there were no other points of comparison given by science at that time, which opposes the greatest difficulties to the study of American antiquities. This obstacle may, to a certain extent, be overcome by establishing the true signification of the *native term* for every institution considered, for every office, as far as this is possible; using *native terminology* as indicative of the true character of *native life*. This course we shall attempt to pursue, in treating the military organization of the Mexicans.[75]

The tribe of Mexico had, soon after its settlement in the marsh where the pueblo was subsequently built up, divided into four sections, or "quarters" ("calpulli"),[76] each of these being composed of certain clusters of kindred, "minor quarters," as Torquemada call them.[77] The four great quarters remained as the principal sub-divisions of the tribe for civil as well as military purposes, and the armed men of each constituted a separate body, regardless of

[75] Thus the Mexican word for tribe, town, and settlement is the same: "altepetl," but the Spaniards have applied it to king also (Molina, II, p. 4). The name "tlatoani," which the Mexicans gave to their principal chiefs, and which is translated into king, signifies "one who speaks" ("hablador," Molina, II, p. 141), from "nitlatoa," to speak ("tlatolli," speech). The council was called "tlatocan," "place of speech," but Molina translates it as "court or palace of great lords." The term "speech," or, rather, the verb "to speak," is found in a number of native terms, like "tlatoca-icpalli," "seat of "the one who speaks," which has been rendered, also, as "throne." There is certainly no approach to a royal title in all this. The so-called "King" was only "one of those "who spoke;" a prominent member of the council. A court of justice, "audiencia," was also "tecutlatoloyan," or "chiefs who are speaking, or bowing their heads."

[76] Durán (Cap. V, p. 42). Acosta (Lib. VII, cap. VII, p. 467). Tezozomoc (Cap. III, p. 9). Herrera (Dec. III, lib II, cap. II, p. 61). "Popol Vuh." Introduction, p. 117, note No. 1, by Mr. Brasseur de Bourbourg, "Enfin, presque toutes les villes ou tribus "sont partagées en quatre clans ou quartiers, dont les chefs forment le grand conseil." Tlatilulco, which was conquered by the Mexicans in 1473, subsequently formed a fifth "quarter." The names of the four original ones were: "Teopan" (place of God), "Aztacaico" (house of the heron), "Moyotlan" (place of the musquito), and "cuepopan." They subsequently formed, under Spanish rule, the *wards* of San Pablo, San Juan, Santa María la Redonda, and San Sebastian. Tlatilulco became the "Indian-ward," and was called Santiago.

[77] (Lib. XIV, cap. VII, p. 545) " . . . . y así estaba ordenado, que en cada pueblo, "conforme tenia el numero, y cantidad de gente, huviese parcialidades de diversas "gentes, y familias. . . . . Estas Parcialidades estaban repartidas por Calpules, "que son Barrios, y sucedia, que una Parcialidad de estas dichas tenia tres, y quatro, "y mas, Calpules, conforme la gente tenia el pueblo, ..." Durán (Cap. V, p. 42) is more explicit, even. After having stated that the Mexicans divided into four principal quarters, he says: "their god commanded them that they should distribute among "themselves the gods, and that each quarter should name and designate particular "quarters where these gods would be worshipped; and thus each quarter divided into

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

174 numbers.[78] They in turn subdivided into squads of from two to
619 four hundred warriors each,[79] being, in all probability, the able-
701 bodied males (priests excepted in many cases) of one particular "kin."[80] These lesser bodies had each their own peculiar "livery,"[81] they carried their own emblem, visible, like a banner, "high above the troop," and finally they disaggregated into fractions of about twenty men.[82] On the eve of an engagement a further sub-division, into groups of four to six, took place, as we shall hereafter see.

701 Having thus sketched, as far as we can, the *division* or *arrange-*
555 *ment* of the Mexican forces, we have yet to investigate how, and by whom, the warriors of the tribe were commanded, how those leaders obtained their offices, and what was the order of their rank and dignity. But here we must premise: *that no office whatever*,

many small ones, according to the number of idols, which they called Calpulteona" (should be "Calpulteotzin"). But their division into at least seven such "barrios," or kindred groups, existed already before this event (Tezozomoc, Cap. I, p. 6. Durán, Cap. III, p. 20). "Rapport sur les differentes classes de Chefs de la Nouvelle-Espagne," par Alonzo de Zurita. French translation by Mr. Ternaux-compans. This important authority, among other statements, makes the striking remark: "Finally, what is called "in New-Spain a calpulli corresponds to what the Jews called a tribe" (p. 53).

[78] Tezozomoc (Cap. XCI, p. 161). When, under the last Montezuma, the fight against Huexotzinco was begun "Cuaulnoctli took charge to assemble together the four lead-"ers of the four quarters for that the arms might be held in readiness."

[79] Anonymous Conqueror (p. 371). Clavigero (Lib. VII, cap. XXIV).

[80] These bodies of two to four hundred men are those mentioned by Durán (Cap. XIX, p. 169) as "cuadrillas," "escadrones," carrying each the "emblem" ("bandera") of its "quarter" ("barrio"). In this case he refers to the "minor quarters." See note No. 82, below.

[81] "Anonymous Conqueror;" also, Bernal-Diez, quoted in text, above.

[82] Anon. Conqueror (p. 371). "ha ogni compagnia il suo Alfiere con la sua insigna "inhastata, en tal modo ligata supra le spalle, che non gli da alcun distorbo di poter "combattere si far cioche vuole, y la porta cosi ligata bene al corpo, che se non fanno "del suo corpo pezzi, non se gli puo sligare, ne torglielamai." Clavigero says (Cap. XXIV, lib. VII): "The banners were more like the "signi" of the Romans than our "flags." The following paragraph of Durán makes it plain that they represented the token of each original body of kindred: "After having eaten, the captains said to their "people: behold, men, that being intermingled with the enemy, some of you might "lose sight of his squadron, therefore Tlacaelel ordains that of each quarter there shall "be an emblem, carried high above the troop, with the arms of such quarter on it, and "that all shall be careful to rally around that banner and flag, and that, besides, they "should call out the names of their respective quarter, so as to be known" (Cap. XIX, p. 169). We have ample descriptions of the emblems of the four quarters of Tlaxcallan, but none of those of Mexico. It is doubtful if there was a national emblem, or central ensign. The statement, that the capture of that central "emblem" decided the fate of the battle, is also very doubtful, notwithstanding Bernal-Diez' pompous description of the fight near Otumpan. See hereafter. It may not be devoid of interest to note here that the Mexican sign for the number *twenty* (20,—"pohualli") was a *flag*. Still, the name for the latter was "quechpanitl," from "quechtli," mantle, and "pani," above.

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

posed,[94] as we have seen, of "the able-bodied men (priests excepted) of one particular group of kindred;" said group forming a sub-division of the four principal quarters of Mexico. Besides leading their files in combat, it was their duty when at home, to instruct the youth of their section in the use and practice of arms. They held their office for life, or as long as they gave satisfaction.[95]

As an exterior token of their rank the "captains" wore large ear-rings and lip-pendants of richer material than their predecessors, and carried rods or staffs in their hands when on duty.[96]

A certain number of these captains, corresponding to the "minor quarters" or groups of kindred contained in the principal quarter to which they belonged, were under the direction of the *war-chief*, or as the Spanish authors call him, the "captain-general" *of that largest subdivision of the tribe*. There were consequently *four* chiefs of that rank at Mexico,[97] and it is probable that a fifth one was added to them not long before the conquest, to command the warriors of Tlatilulco.[98]

Beyond the mere facts of their existence, of their being always elected for life-time, and a strong supposition that their titles are given by all authorities, without stating it positively, however, little is known unfortunately, about these chieftains.[99] They were

[94] Sahagun (Lib. IX, cap. VI. p. 264). "El maestro de campo o capitan es de esta "calidad. que para mostrar su oficio trae coleta cabellos que cuelga atras, y bezote y "oregeras. y trae siempre sus armas consigo." (The latter is doubtful, *at least*.)

[95] Durán (Cap. XXVI, p. 216). In regard to their eligibility, see Ternaux-Compans ("Recueil de Pièces," "De l'ordre de succession," p. 225), "Il n'y avait pas d'autres élections d'officiers." Although untrue in regard to the "other officers." Zurita ("Rapport." p. 61). "The election takes place among themselves."

[96] Durán (Cap. XIX, p. 169), "luego salieron los viejos que tenian oficios de ordenar "la gente de guerra. que eran como maestres de campo, con sus bastones en las manos "y unas cintas apretadas á la caneça y unas oregeras de concha, largas, y unas bezotes "en los labios. muy bien armados, y empeçaron á componer la gente." Also, Sahagun (Lib. IX, cap. VI, p. 264).

[97] Tezozomoc (Cap. XCI, p. 161): "Cuauhnoctli took charge to assemble together "the four leaders of the four quarters, for that the arms might be ready." The origin of these four titles and dignities dates back to the successful foray against Cuyuacan (under Itzcoatl); at least, *then* they are first mentioned (Tezozomoc: Cap. XV, p. 24, and Durán: Cap. XI, p. 97). As members of the council of chiefs, they appear, however, always as "principal chiefs" only. Tezozomoc being the only one who, to our knowledge, speaks of the "leaders of the four quarters" ("cuatro caudillos de los cuatro barrios").

Torquemada (Lib. IV, cap. LXX, p. 499) speaks of "Itzquauhtin, señor de Tlatilulco," as companion of Montezuma during the latter's captivity among the Spaniards. He copies from Sahagun (Lib. XII).

[98] It is a very singular fact that the offices of these four principal war-chiefs should have attracted so little attention, but we may account for it by the prevailing assump-

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

[74] soil *which they might hold as their own.*[25] It would appear that, through loss of numbers in the course of their migrations, as well as through divisions among themselves, the original consanguine groups composing the body, had been reduced to *five.*[26] Now a further and last division took place, one of these kindred clusters seceding from the rest, and establishing itself apart on another sandy expanse where, close to the others however, it grew to become the tribe of Mexico-Tlatilulco.[27] It remained independent until about forty years before the conquest.[28]—The other *four* settled *each one by itself*, but still acknowledging a *common government*, in token of which the tribal place of worship was erected at the spot where these four areas met. Thus the "pueblo" of Mexico-Tenuchtitlan was founded; the seat and home of the Mexicans proper.[29]

[25] Ixtlilxochitl ("Histoire des Chichimèques," cap. X, p. 72), says that the Mexicans "asked the King of Azcaputzalco for soil" (to settle upon). Torquemada represents their settlement as a flight to a safe place (Lib. II, cap. XI, p. 92). Also Mendieta (Lib. II, cap. XXXV, pp. 147 and 148). Durán (Cap. V, p. 41), has the remarkable passage following: "que aun el suelo no era suyo, pues era sitio y término de los de Azcaputzalco y de los de Tezcuco; porque alli llegaban los términos del uno y del otro pueblo, y por la otra parte del Mediodia, términos de Culhuacan:" (This shows they were on neutral ground, dividing the tribes of their surroundings.) Tezozomoc confirms (Cap. III, p. 9), "estando en terminos de los de Atzcapuzalco, Acuihuaques Tezcucanos y los de Culhuacan." Durán (2ª p. 41) further says that they contended to be masters of their soil, without owing allegiance or obedience to any one. See also Tezozomoc (Cap. III) and Motolinia ("Epistola proemial," p. 5). Gomara ("Conquista," p. 431. Vedia, 1st volume).

[69] [642] [26] We have already alluded to the number of chiefs leading the Mexicans at the time of their settlement in the lagune. It varies from four to twenty. But the fact that four "quarters" composed it originally, leads me to the belief that four Mexican kinships remained, one seceding as the tribe of Tlatilulco. This division into four is the only fact reliably ascertained. (See notes 27, 29, 30 and 31).

[27] This fact is too amply proven to need special references. How it occurred we cannot ascertain, since it is related in the most varied manner by the different sources of authority. If the statement is correct that even during their migrations, the Mexicans proper and the Tlatilulcás kept apart, as tribal components, or probably "phratries,"—then the fact of their localizing as tribes independent from each other is easily accounted for. See Veytia (Lib. II, cap. XV, p. 135).

[28] The date of its conquest by the Mexicans is about 1473 ("Art of War, etc." p. 109). It can easily be verified from the date on the so-called "calendar stone" at the city of Mexico. (See "Calendario Azteca" by Señor Chavero.)

[615] [618] [29] The question remains yet undecided as to whether these four "quarters" ("barrios") were four original kinships, or whether they were already four "brotherhoods of kinships" (phratries), analogous to the Roman curiæ formed by (or rather remaining as the last vestige of) original kinships disaggregated. The latter might appear likely from the fact of the greater number of chiefs (than four), mentioned by the old authors. The existence of still lesser groups is plainly acknowledged at the same time. Durán says (Cap. V, p. 42): "On the night after the Mexicans finished the place of worship ("hermita donde su dios estaba"), a large area of the lagune being filled up and room made for the houses, Vitzilopochtli spoke to his priest or keeper and said to him:

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

Secondly, the relationships in the descending scale are more closely described than those in the ascending scale.

Thirdly, in some instances women give different names from those given by men.

It results from it, that the classificatory system still, to a great extent, predominated in the ancient Mexican nomenclature for relationship, while the more modern descriptive system appears in a minority of cases only. This leads to the inference that the Mexican family itself was yet but imperfectly constituted. It was not yet so established as to form a definite group and hence cannot be expected to exercise any influence in the matter of public social life. We are, therefore, again justified in looking to the *kin* as the unit of social organization, within the limits of that widest aggregate, the tribe.[96]

Traditionary tales about the earliest settlement of man in Mexico as well as in Central America, distinctly ascribe it to "lineages" or relationships. The tribe is merely implied, and appears in a definite form only *after* this settlement has already occurred.

The "Popol-Vuh," or gathering of the cosmological and traditionary records of the QQuiché tribe of Guatemala, after enumerating the four wives of the four first men created, even says: "These [their spouses], engendered mankind, the large and small tribes: and they were the stock of us, of the QQuiché tribe." This indicates, perhaps, descent in the female line at a very early date.[97]

[96] *Dr. Adolphus Bastian*, "*Ueber die Ehenerhältnisse.*" ("*Zeitschrift für Ethnologie,*" Berlin, Vol. V, 1874) presupposes a family, definite and distinct: "Aus der Ehe, als erster Kreisung der Gesellschaft geht die Familie hervor, in ausgedehnter Peripherie als gens (unter Erweiterung durch die Agnaten) aus ursprunglichen Patriciern; wo der Clan unter Aufnahme fictiver Verwandten und zugehörigen seinen abschluss unter den Patriarchen bewahrt." Such views offer a sufficient explanation, when applied indiscriminately to the inhabitants of *all* the continents, why the organization of some aborigines of this continent is still regarded as monarchical. The nature and functions of the Indian kin are completely misunderstood and proportionately misrepresented. (See also Id., p. 316.)

[97] "*Popol-Vuh*" (Translated from the original QQuiché by the *Abbé Charles Etienne Brasseur de Bourbourg*, Paris, 1861, Part III, cap. III, p. 305). "E pogol vinak, chuti amag, nima amag; are cut u xe kech. ri oh Quecho-vinak; tzatz cut x-uxic ri Ahqixb Ahqahb; mana xa E cahib chic x-uxic. xere cahib ri qui chuch oh quiche vinak." Mr. Brasseur translates "vinak" alternately as men, tribes, and nations. According to his own vocabulary, however, it means but "man" or "the increase" (See "*Grammaire QQuiché,*" p. 222). In his translation of the "*Rabinal-Achí*" ("*Grammaire*" First Scene, pp. 27 and 35, and other places), "vinak" is also rendered as chief. But the true QQuiché word for tribe is "amag" ("*Grammaire,*" p. 167). This alters the sense to the extent that instead of "QQuiché tribe" it should read "men of QQuiché" or rather "QQuiché

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

uine aboriginal traditions, notwithstanding the attempt, on the part of Fray Juan de Torquemada, to impugn its truthfulness and consequently its validity.[42] It results from it that while the kins, which for the first time in Mexican history are distinctly identified here with the "calpulli," are settling, "as best they liked;" the creation of four geographical divisions, composed each of a number of kins, is attributed here to the influence of worship or, as we have already termed it, of "medicine." This connects those, who subsequently became the four "Indian wards" of Mexico, with the four "carriers of the gods" already mentioned, and this perhaps may be considered a reminiscence of the four original relationships. Of these the sections mentioned appear like a shell, geographically enclosing a number of settled kins. The supposition is not, therefore, devoid of interest that they may have represented brotherhoods of kins, for purposes of worship and warfare. If now we substitute for *kin* the term "*gens*" adopted by Mr. Morgan, those *brotherhoods* necessarily appear in the light of as many "*phratries*."[43]

The time of this occurrence seems almost to coincide with a division (already indicated as in progress) of the original Mexican band into *two* sections. It now culminated in the secession of a part of the tribe and its settlement apart from the main body, though not far away from it and within the lagune also. While the "place of the stone and prickly pear" (Tenuchtitlan) remained, virtually, ancient Mexico, the seceding group founded the Pueblo of Tlatilulco as an independent community at the very door of the former. It appears as its rival even until forty-eight years previous to the Spanish conquest.[44]

[42] "*Tenure of Lands*" (p. 402, notes 33 and 33).

[43] *Morgan* ("*Ancient Society*," Part II, cap. III, p. 88) "The phratry is a brotherhood, as the term imports, and a natural growth from the organization into gentes. It is an organic union or association of two or more gentes of the same tribe, for certain common objects. These gentes were usually such as had been formed by the segmentation of an original gens." If we recall the manner in which the four "quarters" or Mexico first appeared, it will easily be seen that the analogy with phratries is indeed striking. Compare, "*Art of War*" (p. 101, and note 22, and pp. 120, 121, and notes 97, 99, 100, and 101). In "*Tenure of Lands*" (pp. 400 and (401), I have rather favored the view that these four were "calpulli" which subsequently segregated into minor quarters or 'barrios.' I now correct this, having become convinced that the so-called minor *quarters already existed at the time of settlement* (*compare notes* 37 *and* 41).

[44] *Motolinia* (Trat. III, cap. VII, p. 180), mentions a division into but two "barrios" in course of time through increase of population. "Despues andando el tiempo y multiplicandose el pueblo y creciendo la vecindad, hizóse esta ciudad dos barrios ó dos ciudades," *Ixtlilxochitl* ("*Hist. des Chichim.*" Cap. p. 73), merely states they were

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

174 It is much to be regretted that our information on this point
114 is so meagre and unsatisfactory, as not to enable us to ascertain
619 whether several *entire kins* separated from the rest to form the new tribe, or whether *fragments of kins* only composed the secessionists. In fact even the cause of the division is stated in such a varied and contradictory manner, that we must withhold any expression of positive views on the subject.

618 Without losing sight altogether of the tribe of Tlatilulco, we still must devote our attention chiefly to the inhabitants of Tenuchtitlan, in which we recognize the ancient Mexicans proper. The number of kins composing the latter at the time of their

divided in two "bands," without saying why and how this division occurred. *Durán* (Cap. V, p. 43), "Hecha esta division y puestos ya en su órden y concierto de barrios, algunos de los viejos y ancianos, entendiendo merecian mas de lo que les daban y que no se les hacia aquella honrá que merecian, se amotinaron y determinaron ir a buscar nuevo asiento, y andando por entre aquellos carriçales y espadañales allaron una albarrada pequeña, y dando noticia della á sus aliados y amigos fuéronse á hacer alli asiento, el qual lugar se llamaba Xaltelulli y el qual lugar agora llamamos Tlatilulco, ques el barrio de Santiago. Los viejos y principales que alli se pasauan fuéron quatro; el uno dellos se llamaba Atlaquauitl, el segundo Huicto, el tercero Opochtli, el quarto Atlacol. Estos quatro señores se dividieron y apartaron de los demas y se fuéron á vivir á este lugar del Tlatilulco, y segun opinion tenidos por hombres inquietos y revoltosos y de malas intenciones, porque desde el dia que alli se pasaron nunca tuvieron paz ni se llevaron bien con sus hermanos los mexicanos; la qual inquietud a ido de mano en mano hasta el dia de hoy, pues siempre a auido y ay bandos y rancor entre los unos y los otros." *Acosta* (Lib. VII, cap. VIII, p. 468), and *Herrera* (Dec. III, lib. II, cap. XII, p. 62), both are but concise repetitions of the above. *Torquemada* (Lib. III, cap. XXIV, pp. 294 and 295), opposes both Acosta and Herrera, as well as the "*Codex Ramirez*," and substitutes a story about voluntary settlement of the Tlatilulca on a sandy patch near by, but apart from the others, in consequence of the old grudge or feud already mentioned. There is but little difference between this version and the preceding, the act of secession, in both, being voluntary. One singular fact is mentioned by *Vetancurt* (Part II, trat. I, cap. XI, p. 269), namely: that the Tlatilulca made a market-place *for both* parties. Otherwise (p. 257), he concurs with Torquemada. *Granados y Galvez* (Tarde 6a, p. 174), after saying that both "eran deudos y parientes unos con otros" adds "whether this division proceeded from past quarrels, or out of the incommodities which they suffered among canes and reeds; it is certain that they divided peaceably . . ." *Veytia* (Lib. II, cap. XV, pp. 135 and 142), reporting on all the various traditions about the foundation of Tlatilulco, comes to the conclusion that the "nobles" retired to Tlatilulco, whereas the "common people" remained at Mexico. *Clavigero* (Lib. II, cap. XV, p. 178), agrees with Veytia in regard to the real import of the fables told concerning the ancient feuds among the migratory band, but (Cap. XVII, pp. 187 and 188), he accepts the version that these old dissensions were the causes of the final division.

I have not been able, yet, to find whether the seceding Tlatilulca formed one kin, or one brotherhood of kins, or whether they were discontented fractions of kins removing. Had Vetancurt given us the names of the "barrios" of Tlatilulco, we might possibly infer something from them. As it is, the fact of the four "principals" mentioned by Durán, seems to indicate four kins, or rather (perhaps) fractions from four kins, whom want of space probably caused to remove. They may have been crowded out, and in course of time the feeling of jealousy and rivalry sprung up of which the authorities speak both freely and frequently. See *Veytia* (Lib. II, cap. XV, p. 135).

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

not form as it is often stated, an order of chivalry, is amply proven by the fact that the bond of kinship interposed a barrier between them and such an imaginary association and furthermore, because their number could not be very great. The formalities required were so numerous and dilatory, the material for distribution in the shape of gifts was so large, that a frequent repetition of the occurrence lay beyond the power of the kin.[174] After this necessary digression, we return once more to the Mexican calpulli.

Besides being as already established in "Tenure of Lands," the unit of territorial possession, we found the Mexican kin to be a *self-governing*, therefore *democratic* cluster. Every one of these clusters had, within itself, all the elements required for independent existence as an organized society. Except for assistance and protection against outsiders, it needed no associates. Hence it follows, that since we find twenty Mexican kins aggregated into a tribe, this tribe was a *voluntary* association, formed for mutual protection.

Three attributes of the tribe are next to self-evident:

1. A particular territory;
2. A common dialect;
3. Common tribal worship.[175]

sa charge á celui qui s'en était rendu digne par ses services, car les fils du défunt n'en héritaient pas s'ils n'en étaient investis." The very fact of the election, and the manner in which it was performed is also evidence. See the various documents in *Ternaux-Compans, 2d Recueil.*

[174] That such a festival or ceremony necessitated the accumulation of much provision and many articles for presents and offerings, is proven by numerous authorities. *Gomara* ("*Conquista*" Vedia I, p. 436): "En fin, en semejantes fiestas no habia pariente pobre. Daban á los señores tecutles y principales convidados plumajes, mantas, tocas, zapatos, bezotes, y orejeras de oro ó plata ó piedras de precia. Esto era mas ó menos, segun la riqueza y animo del nuevo tecuitli, y conforme á las personas que se daba. Tambien hacia grandes ofrendas al templo y á los sacerdotes." *Zurita* ("*Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs* etc.," p. 98): "Ces solennités occasionnaient de grandes dépenses, car les assistants étaient fort nombreux; c'étaient les parents, les alliés et les domestiques du nouveau dignitaire. L'on faisait aussi des aumones considérables aux pauvres." "*Des Cérémonies observées autrefois par les Indiens lorsqu'ils faisaient un Tecle.*" (1st *Recueil*, p. 235): "Celui que l'on nommait *Tecle*, devait d'abord posséder de grands biens, qu'il put donner aux prêtres et aux autres nobles." (P. 237): "Un grand nombre ne pouvait pas se procurer en si peu de temps la quantité suffisante, etc., etc." *Mendieta* (Lib. II, cap. XXXVIII, p. 156): "Y asi los costaba excesivo trabajo y gasto, como aqui se dirá." (Id., cap. XXXIX, pp. 160 and 161.) *Veytia* ("*Historia Antigua*," Lib. II, cap. IX, pp. 65 and 66): "Y era exhorbitantisimo el gasto, por cuya causa algunos, cuyas facultades y caudal no era suficiente á reportarlos, dejaban de tomar este dictado." *H. H. Bancroft* (Vol. II, p. 199): "As before remarked, the vast expenses entailed upon a Tecuhtli debarred from the honor many who were really worthy of it."

[175] For these three attributes of tribal organization I refer to *Morgan* ("*Ancient Society*," p. 113).